

## **REMARKS**

### **I. General**

Claims 1-65 are current pending in the present application. Of these claims, claims 1, 19, 32, 48, 63, and 64 are independent claims. The remainder of the claims depend directly or indirectly from these independent claims. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The only prior art cited is made of record. Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's bases for rejecting the claims.

### **II. Claims 1-18**

Claim 1 is an independent claim, and claims 2-18 depend directly or indirectly from it. In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner stated the following:

In claim 1, the phrase "a system client that a system user uses" is unclear.

Also in claim 1, the phrase "system storage system" in lines 11, 17, 25, 28 [is unclear.]

Is the central system code at line 26 the same as the central server code at line 24?

Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's grounds for rejecting claim 1 and amended it to overcome the bases for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicants have traversed the Examiner's bases for rejecting claim 1 and placed it in condition for allowance. Applicants, therefore, request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-18 depend from claim 1. The Examiner rejected claims 2-18 for the deficiencies of claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 14 so that it is consistent with claim 1. By Applicants amending claims 1 and 14 as set forth herein, claims 2-18 overcome the Examiner's bases for rejecting these claims. As such, claims 2-18 are in condition for allowance the same as claim 1. Therefore, the rejection that has been applied to claims 2-18 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

### **III. Claims 19-31 and 32-47**

Claim 19 is an independent claim and claims 20-32 depend from it, and claim 32 is an independent claim and claim 33-47 depend from it. The Examiner rejected claims 19 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because it is contended that the phrase “for controlling processing for manipulating” at the cited locations is unclear. Applicants have amended claims 19 and 32 to overcome the Examiner’s basis for rejection of these claims. Therefore, claims 19 and 32 are now in condition for allowance. As such, it is appropriate for the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 19 and 32 based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 20-31 depend from claim 19, and claims 33-47 depend from claim 32. Where appropriate, dependent claims 20-31 have been amended to be consistent with claim 19, and claims 33-47 have been amended to be consistent with claim 32.

Claims 20-31 and 33-47 were rejected because they depended from rejected base claims 19 and 32, respectively. Given that claims 19 and 32 have been amended to overcome the Examiner’s bases for rejection, these claims, like claims 19 and 32, are now in condition for allowance. Noting this, the Examiner should withdraw the bases for the rejection of claims 20-31 and 33-47.

### **IV. Claims 48-62**

The Examiner rejected claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the stated reason that the term “system storage systems” is unclear. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 48 to overcome this basis for rejection, thereby placing claim 48 in condition for allowance. Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, that has been applied to claim 48.

Claims 49-62 depend from claim 48. Claims 49-62 were rejected because of this dependence. Since claim 48 has been amended to overcome the Examiner’s basis for rejection, then claims 49-62, like claim 48, are in condition for allowance. Thus, the Examiner should withdraw the basis for rejection of claims 49-62.

### **V. Claim 63**

The Examiner has rejected claim 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and stated the following:

At claim 63, line 2, a system client first occurrence is mentioned; which other system is that including the system client?

Line 8 of claim 63, the phrase “be processing” should perhaps be “be processed.”

Applicants have reviewed the Examiner’s statements above and amended claim 63 to overcome these bases for rejection. As such, the claim 63 is in condition for allowance and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

## **VI. Claims 64 and 65**

The Examiner rejected claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and stated that the phrase “a system client, with the system including the system client” was unclear. Applicants have considered the Examiner’s basis for rejection and amended claims 64 to overcome this rejection. As such, the claim 64 is in condition for allowance and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Claim 65 depends from claim 64. Claim 65 was rejected because it depended from a rejected base claim. Since claim 64 has been amended to overcome the Examiner’s basis for rejection, then claim 65, like claim 64, is in condition for allowance. Thus, the Examiner should withdraw the basis for the rejection of claim 65.

**VII. Conclusion**

Applicant has traversed the Examiner's bases from rejecting pending claims 1-65 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Having traversed these rejections, the claims of the application are in condition for allowance.

The present application is new, non-obvious, and useful. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Wayne M. Kennard  
Reg. No. 30,271

Dated: 9/6/2015

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
617-526-6183  
617-526-5000 Facsimile